

# CHRISTIAN SECRETARY.

PUBLISHED BY PHILEMON CANFIELD, CENTRAL ROW, HARTFORD, FOR THE CONNECTICUT BAPTIST CONVENTION.

VOL. II.

MONDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 28, 1825.

No. 44.

## CONDITIONS.

The Christian Secretary is published every Monday morning, at Central Row, six rods South of the State House, at Two Dollars a year, if paid in three months from the time of subscribing, if not an addition of 50 cents, except where there is a special agreement otherwise.—*Postage paid by subscribers.*  
The profits of this paper are, by the Convention, held sacred to the cause of Missions.  
A discount of twelve and a half per cent will be made to Agents who receive and pay for five or more copies.  
All subscriptions are understood to be made for one year, unless there is a special agreement to the contrary, at the time of subscribing.  
Twenty-five cents will be allowed to Agents for every good subscriber which they shall obtain for the Secretary, and return the names to this office.  
No paper will be stopped except at the option of the publisher, until notice is given, and arrearages paid.  
All letters on the subject of this paper, or Communications for it, should be addressed to the Editor of the Christian Secretary—POST PAID.  
Advertisements inserted at the usual prices.

## MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCE.

### MR. WOLF'S ACCOUNT OF THE ARMENIANS.

The Armenians are a distinct race of people, inhabiting the N. E. part of Turkey in Asia, and the adjacent districts in Persia. They seldom intermarry with other tribes, and profess a peculiar religion, the basis of which is Christianity. In their commercial habits, and in their disposition to migrate to foreign countries, they are not unlike the Jews. They form the chief class of traders in the Persian empire, and they are found scattered in almost all the principal cities of Asia, engaged in the most extensive commercial undertakings, and bearing a high character for integrity in their dealings. The following particulars relating to this interesting people, were obtained by Mr. Wolf from the Armenian Bishop at Basorah:

*Quest.*—What is the origin of the name of Armenia?

*Bishop.* The name Armenia is taken from Arm, one of the sons of Hayk, who was one of those who built the tower of Babel. The Armenians are likewise called Hayk.

*Quest.* What do the Armenians believe of Jesus Christ?

*Bishop.* Christ is perfect man and perfect God, and the Son of God, and one person of the Trinity.

#### Their manner of Baptism.

The godfather takes the child, and stands at the door of the church. The priest cometh, and asks, What do you wish? The godfather says, I wish the child to be baptized. *Priest.* (Prays, and says,) Do you believe in the glorious Trinity? *Godfather.* Yes, I myself and the child do believe in the glorious Trinity, God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; one of those three is Christ, the true Son of God, and our Saviour, born of the Virgin Mary by the Holy Ghost, born after nine months, whom we believe to be perfect man, and perfect God. He preached in the world, and suffered all the pains of the cross, was crucified, died, and was buried, for the sake of our in-dwelling sin; and by this he saved us from the power of the devil, and after three days he rose again, and then ascended upwards towards heaven, where he sits at the right hand of the Father; and he will come again to judge the quick and the dead.—Then they enter the church, near the water. The priest prays over the water, and puts three drops of the holy oil into the water, and then the priest asks the godfather three times, What do you wish for this child? *Godfather.* I wish you to baptize the child, to be saved from original sin, and the devil, and to serve the Lord. *Priest.* It shall be done according to your desire.—Then the Priest puts the child into the water, and washeth the head with three handfuls of water, and prays, and saith: I baptize thee in the name, &c. and then dips the child three times in the water, and names the child, and then gives it to the godfather, and says thus: Christ having been baptized in the river Jordan, the heavens were opened, and the Holy Ghost descended upon Him like a dove.—Then the priest prays again, and anoints with ointment, 1st. the forehead of the child, saying: The holy oil put on thy face, may it be to thee a seal of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that his grace should be upon thee! 2dly, On the eyes of the child, saying: Oh! that thy eyes may be opened, and that thou mayest never slumber

the sleep of eternal death! 3dly, He anoints the ear of the child, saying: Oh! that thou mayest hear the commands of our Saviour, and the Gospel! 4thly, He anoints the nose of the child, saying: Oh! that it may be a savour to you of the world to come! 5thly, He anoints the mouth of the child, saying: Oh! that every evil conversation may be banished out of thy mouth! 6thly, He anoints the hands of the child, saying: Oh! that thy hands may always be prone to do good! 7thly, He anoints the child upon his heart, and saith: Oh! that the holy Spirit may be put into thy heart, and give thee a new heart! 8thly, He anoints the back, and saith: By this seal of the Holy Ghost mayest thou be kept from the insidious assaults of the devil! And lastly, He anoints the feet of the child, saying: Oh! that thou mayest walk in the best road, leading to life everlasting!—The child wears, for three days, a white shirt, and a coat of white and red colour, indicating the divinity and humanity of Jesus Christ. Some drops of the consecrated wine are given the child.

From the Baptist Register.

### DWIGHTS THEOLOGY.

Mr. Editor,

It has afforded me peculiar pleasure to see the rapid and general circulation of Dr. Dwight's valuable Theology, not only in his own country, but in Europe. It has no doubt in many instances proved a powerful antidote against the shrouded deistical opinions of the present day. But like all other human productions it has its imperfections. The most prominent of these appear to me, to respect the proper subjects of baptism, and the definition of certain terms, used in reference to this ordinance. However, on a careful perusal of these works as a whole, we see that he has fully guarded the reader against any improper bias. What he says in one place of an improper tendency, appears to be completely neutralized in another. I would furnish you with a few instances of this kind.

I. On the church membership of infants, he says: "But this covenant (made with Abraham,) being then the only covenant of grace, which God has ever made with mankind; the terms, and therefore the extent of it must ever continue the same, unless repealed, or otherwise altered by its Author.—But this covenant was as really and as expressly made with infants, as with adults. If then God has not declared in some manner or other, that he will no longer comprise infants within his covenant, it still comprises them. But he has made no such declaration in any manner whatever: infants are therefore comprised in the covenant."—(Vol. v. p. 313, first edition.)

The members of the church are called sons of God twelve times in the scriptures; his children twice in the Old, and ten times in the New Testament; and his people in instances too numerous to be reckoned. In all these instances, the sons, and children of God, denote those who are such by adoption; and in very many, the phrase, the people of God, has the same meaning. But the adopted children of God are Christians. The original church, therefore, consisted of Christians; or in other words, those who were subjects of faith, repentance, and holiness.—(Vol. v. p. 151.)

The same doctrine is also illustrated by the ordinance of baptism. In the administration of this ordinance, persons are baptized not in but into "the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" that is, by his appointment they are introduced into his family, and take his name upon them, as being his children.—ib.

No national connexion, therefore, with a church, no descent from Abraham, gave a right to any wicked Israelite to take the covenant into his mouth.—vol. v. p. 153.

Heb. x. 21, 28: "Having an High Priest over the house of God, let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; for he is faithful that promised." In these instances a profession of faith, or of religion, is evidently spoken of as having been made by Christians universally. To Timothy the same Apostle says, i. Tim. vi. 22: "Fight the good fight of faith; lay hold on eternal life; whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed, or having professed, a good profession before many witnesses." What Timothy did in this respect, is reasonably supposed to have been done by all other Christians.—vol. v. p. 158.

The answer of a good conscience towards God, mentioned by St. Peter, as given at the time of baptism, i. Pet. iii. 21,

denotes in my view, the same profession.—Also i. John, iv. 15.

From these passages of scripture, it appears to one, evident, that Christians are required, not only to believe the religion of Christ in their hearts, but also to profess it with their mouths; that such a profession was universally made by the Christians under the conduct of the Apostles; and that such as did not make this profession were not considered as Christians.—vol. v. p. 158.

But this promise (2. Cor. vi. 16.) could not be made to those who were not Christians, however decent, moral, and unobjectionable they might be in their external deportment. The persons to whom the text is addressed, were addressed as Christians only; because the promise cannot have been made to any others. But it this church had in the Apostle's view, been intentionally and scripturally made up of others besides Christians, he could not have addressed them in language applicable only to Christians.—ib. p. 150.

What then, it will be asked, constitutes persons members of particular churches? The answer is at hand, it is a covenant, mutually made by Christians, to worship God together, in the same manner, and in accordance with the same principles; and to unite together in the same fellowship, and the same discipline.—ib. p. 258.

Every communicant is, I believe, supposed by every church, not grossly warped from the faith, to have made a profession of the religion of the Gospel, when he entered the church.—ib. p. 159.

There is, there can be, between Christians and sinners, as members of the church of Christ, no community of interests, views, affections, or designs. A church intentionally made up of these discordant materials, may be a decent company of men; but it will very imperfectly sustain the character of a church of Christ.—ib. p. 163.

The character of the church as given in the New Testament, will be sufficiently learned from the following passages.

To the church at Rome, St. Paul writes in these terms, "Among whom are ye also called of Jesus Christ: To all that are in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints. First I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all; that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world."—Rom. 1. 6—8. "And I myself am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye also are full of goodness; filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another."—Rom. xv. 14.

To the Corinthians he writes, "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints. I thank my God always on your behalf for the grace of God, which is given you by Christ Jesus."—1. Cor. 1. 2. 4.

To the Galatians he writes, "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are children of the promise."—Gal. vi. 28.

To the Ephesians he writes, "Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, to the saints who are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus."—Eph. 1. 1.

To the Philippians he writes, "I thank my God for your fellowship in the gospel, from the first day until now: being confident of this very thing, that He who hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ."—Phil. 1. 3. 5. 6.

To the Colossians he writes, "Paul an Apostle, to the saints and faithful brethren in Christ, who are at Colosse; we give thanks to God, since we have heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love which ye have to all the saints, for the hope which is laid up for you in heaven."—Col. 1. 1—5.

To the Thessalonians he writes, "We give thanks to God always for you all, remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope, in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God, even our Father; knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God."—1. Thess. 2—4.

To the Hebrews he writes, "Brethren, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation."—Heb. vi. 9.

St. James, speaking of himself, and of the churches to whom he wrote, says, "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures."—James 1. 18.

St. Peter writes to the churches in Pontus, &c. "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the spirit, unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."—1. Pet. i. 2.

St. John says, "I write unto you, little children, because you have known Him that is from the beginning."

St. Jude, addressing his epistle to the churches generally, writes, "To them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called."—Jude 1.

With this language every thing in the New Testament perfectly harmonizes. One character, and one only, is given in it of the church; and that is the character of Christians. There is no mixture of any character. Even when the faults of its members are mentioned, they are mentioned solely as the backslidings of Christians; and never as the sins of unbelieving and impenitent men. How then, can we entertain a rational doubt, that God, when he instituted his church, intended it to be an assembly of believers?—ib. pp. 165, 166.

II. On the import of the Greek *eis*, He says, "I will therefore, not avail myself of what might however be justly alleged, to wit, that *eis*, may with equal propriety signify *to* and *ek* from.—ib. p. 340.

This he refutes when he says, "St. Paul asks, know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death.—Rom. vi. 34. For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body.—1. Cor. xii. 13. As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.—Gal. iii. 27. In all these instances the phraseology is the same with that first quoted; and from analogy, teaches us that it [*eis*] ought there also, to have been rendered in the same manner; *into* being the original and proper meaning of the preposition."—ib. p. 294—5.

GAUIS.

### ANTI-MISSIONARY AND ANTI-BIBLICAL SPIRIT IN RUSSIA.

A few weeks ago, we stated briefly that most of the Scottish missionaries in the south of Russia had been withdrawn from the empire. We were not at that time particularly acquainted with the causes which led to this measure, but we now learn from the Report of the Directors of the Scottish Missionary Society, that it is to be ascribed principally to the oppressive and intolerant measures of the Russian government. It would seem that the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of the empire have combined in the attempt to arrest the progress of knowledge and unadulterated Christianity, and that they are determined to throw all possible obstacles in the way of the missionaries and those who are united with them in the propagation of religious truth. The following extracts from the Report will be read with deep and painful interest:

#### Anti-Biblical Revolution in Russia.

A great revolution has of late taken place in Russia in regard to the Bible Society. This institution, which for several years pursued so distinguished a career, and promised to supply with the Word of Life, not only the Russian population, but the numerous heathen and Mahomedan tribes of that widely extended Empire, is now completely paralyzed in its exertions, and appears to be dying a lingering death. In consequence of the powerful opposition which was raised to the Bible Society, Prince Galitzin, its noble President, retired from that office; he, at the same time resigned his situation of Minister of Religion, and a Russian Admiral was appointed in his place. Its no less excellent Secretary, Mr. Papoff, who visited this country about two years ago, and who was connected with the censorship of the press, was afterward put on his trial by the Criminal Court respecting a book which had been publishing by Haster Gossner, in which there were some reflections which were considered as unfavourable to the doctrine of the Greek Church relative to the Virgin Mary. Several others were also involved in the same prosecution, two of them pious men. Pastor Gossner himself, who though a Catholic, is said to be a most eloquent, evangelical, and useful preacher, had previous to this been ordered away from Petersburg on a few days' notice. The Powers of Darkness, in short, appear to be mustering their forces in the Russian empire; the measures pursued seem to be a part of that general system for arresting the progress of light, and for involving the nations in all the darkness of the middle ages, which has of late years constituted the distinguishing characteristic of the policy of most of the Continental Princes.

Among the fruits of the revolution in regard to the Bible Society in Russia it

may be mentioned, that though it was at one time intended that the Missionaries at Astrachan should be employed in printing a new and correct edition of Martyn's Persian New Testament, and that the types had been ordered and had arrived in Petersburg, it has been since resolved not to proceed with the printing of it. The Missionaries were likewise informed, that the Tartar-Turkish version of the Old Testament, preparing by Mr. Dickson would have to be submitted to the Arch-bishops of Astrachan, Kazan and Ecaterinoslave; so that the publication, in Russia, of the Old Testament in that language, even if the version were completed, may be considered as very problematical. In the present state of affairs, it was not even deemed safe so print Tracts without submitting them to the Censorship; for though their having done so formerly was winked at, it was not supposed it would be tolerated now; and the punishment for a breach of the law on this head, would be not only the suppression of the work, but severe fine, if not even banishment.

### UNITARIAN ANTIDOTE.

GOD was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.—1st Tim. iii. 16.

Unitarian Principles, if true, shut all men out of heaven, by denying the Saviour's Divine nature, and Atonement; seeing All have sinned, and are guilty before God, Rom. iii. 19. And a created being—can by no means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him, Ps. xlix. 7.

Hebrews i. 5. 6, 7, it is written, when he (the Father) bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, Let all the Angels of God worship him.\*\*\*Thy throne O God, is for ever and ever. Hence Reason concludes that Christ is essentially God; or all the Angels of God (who disobey not his command) are idolaters.

The Oracle of God declares, All manner of sin and blasphemy (against the Father and the Son) shall be forgiven to men; but blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven. Hence Reason, "infallible Reason!" infers, If either is greatest in the adorable Trinity, it is God the Holy Ghost.

But greater or less in infinity, is not; inferior Godhead shocks our sense; Jesus was inferior to the Father, as touching his manhood, John xiv. 28. He was a Son given, and slain, intentionally from the foundation of the world. Rev. xiii. 8.—And the first born from the dead, of every creature. Col. 1. 15, 18.

But our Redeemer, from everlasting, Isa. lxiii. 16, had not the inferior name of Son: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, from eternity, and the Word made flesh, was God; and dwelt among us, John 1. 14. x. 30. And as it was in the beginning, so after his ascension, his name is called, The Word of God, Rev. xix. 13. He who is, and who was, and who cometh—He that liveth, and was dead, and is alive forevermore, saith, I am Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, the Lord God Almighty, Isa. xlv. 6. Rev. i. 5. 8. 18.

Rec. & Tel.

REVIVAL IN MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE.—A letter from a student, in Middlebury College to a gentleman in Boston, dated October 19, says:—"In our College, the still small voice of God is heard, speaking conviction to the hearts of the impenitent. The greatest share of those who are without hope, are making the interesting inquiry, 'What shall I do to be saved?' Three have expressed hopes, and three more give satisfactory evidence of having passed from death to life. Our prospects in College are more encouraging every hour. But the work stops not here. There is a cloud, the business of a man's hand, gathering over the inhabitants of this town, and there is 'a sound of abundance of rain.' In a few families, in different parts of the town, almost every individual member is beginning to tremble, in view of his alarming situation. O pray continually for the prosperity of Zion in this place. Boston Rec. and Tel.

From the late report of the Executive committee of the Mass. Baptist Education society, it appears that during the 11 years of its existence 65 young men have been received to its charities, between 20 and 30 of whom have already been ordained, and are labouring in different places with favourable prospects. The present number of beneficiaries is 21. The committee also report in favour of the establishment of a Baptist Theological Seminary in the vicinity of Boston.



(Continued from fourth page.)

ties of the judgment day, and the terrors of hell to be frittered down to denote only the pains and sorrows which attend man in this world? If it be so, as some pretend, that sin is punished in the present life, then how absurd to talk of salvation; of being saved by the mercy and grace of Christ! A criminal who has suffered the penalty of the law, or all that his crimes deserve, is not to be told that his liberation is an act of grace. He has a right to demand his liberty on the ground of justice. In like manner, if men receive the due punishment of their sins in this life, they can claim exemption from future punishment as a right; and in this case, instead of all being saved by Christ, none will be saved by him. All will be discharged on the ground of justice, and the whole system of grace revealed in the Bible, sinks into a mere farce.

In my next I shall mention some other evasions, and examine some of the texts on which Universalism relies for support. Yours, &c.

From the London Baptist Magazine.

## BAPTISTS IN FRANCE.

A considerable feeling has of late existed in some parts of the Continent, and especially in France, on the subject of Baptism; but it has been detained in the back ground as much as possible. I would not say the subject has never been made too prominent a feature, both in the writings and conversation of some excellent men, but as a Christian doctrine of the ritual or ceremonial class, while I would not wish to see it occupying a situation among the articles of our faith essential to salvation, I cannot think it should lie in the deadly shadow of the Church of Rome. If it be a New Testament doctrine, set it fairly in the light of the New Testament; if not, let it be "hid among the things that are abolished."

The little tract under the title of "*La Famille Baptiste*, or a familiar Treatise on the subject of Infant Baptism," has recently been published at Geneva, in consequence of an attack made upon the Baptists in that part of the world. Several copies of it were consigned to a bookseller at Paris, for a gentleman of that city. The contents of the parcel became known to some persons who wished to suppress the agitation of the subject, and they persuaded the bookseller, as a matter of prudence, to detain it. This he did for a time, but was, at last, compelled to relinquish the treasure.

One of the copies having come into my possession, I have turned a few pages of it into English; and should it be thought that a translation of the whole will be acceptable, and the publication carry a profit worth the acceptance of the Baptist Missionary Society, or either of our other Institutions, it shall, if the Lord will, be sent to the press with that view. The first twelve pages of the little book in question, are at your service for the Magazine, if you think the translation may be interesting to your readers. C. S.

Kensington Gravel Pits.

To the Editor of the Baptist Magazine.

## First Conversation.

Augustus. Papa! have you had us baptized?

Father. No, my dear child. Why do you ask me that question?

Aug. Oh, because every body is baptized;—and then—people call me names; they say I am a heathen.

F. Do you believe in Jesus, my dear child? Do you think that he is the Son of God, and that he atoned for your sins upon the cross?

Augustus was a child nine years of age, and appeared, for some time past, to have received the principal truths of the gospel. He answered, therefore, affirmatively to his father's question. Yes, papa, I believe in Jesus.

Well then, said the father, What are the privileges of those who believe in Jesus?

Aug. "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to those who believe on his name."

F. Can you not finish the passage?

Aug. "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." John i. 12, 13.

F. You think then to be saved, and that you are a child of God?

Aug. Through the grace of God, I do, dear papa.

F. And those who insult God, my child, and who talk of having been baptized; do you think if they are habitually doing so, that they can be children of God, and Christians?

Aug. They are not the Children of God; but I have been told that one may be a Christian without being a child of God.

F. My dear child, we ought not to judge but by the sacred scriptures; there I see that the word Christian is applied only to disciples of Christ; men who had believed in him by the preaching of the Apostles.

Here he opened the Bible at Acts xi. 25, and then at 1 Pet. iv. 16, remarking at the same time, that Peter spoke of Christians as of those that partook of the sufferings of Christ, and on whom the spirit of glory and of God rested, (verse

13, 14). It appears then, added he, that the names of Christian, and child of God, are synonymous; and I believe they only should be baptized, who have faith in Christ.

Yes, cried John; (a fine well grown child, seven years of age, frank and simple, who nevertheless, was sometimes a little artful and mischievous), but we who love so much the Saviour, why do you not baptize us?

That is another question, answered his father: I should not have so much objection, my dear, to administer to you this symbol of entrance into the church of Christ, for it has, I trust, been given to you to believe in him; but your views, my children, are so far from settled, that it appears more desirable to wait till you arrive at an age which will more fully prove the reality of your faith. In the mean time, you are not deprived of any of the means of grace, by deterring your baptism.

Oh! Sir, I can no longer contain myself, cried a female servant who had heard me. It is written, "your children are sanctified," and I will never give up that. It is dreadful to deprive these poor little dears of the seal of Christianity, as if they were Jews or Turks.

This servant had slipped into the room at the beginning of the conversation, and had remained, under the pretence of arranging some of the furniture, and wiping the dust from the rest. She was a faithful child of God, of exemplary piety, but who had not hitherto been able to restrain her emotions of impatience, whenever this subject was discussed.

"*Vos enfants sont saints*," [Your children are holy], she repeated with energy; Yes, the promise is made to you and to your children;—in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father, which is in heaven." Matt. xviii. 10.

"*ILs sont saints*," [they are holy], said she once more, with an accent which I can only describe, by writing in great letters as you see it here.

Mary, said her master, you are a child of God. Will you do a good action? Will you save a soul?

What made you think of that, said she; would to God I could! But what do you mean?

F. You know Henry, our neighbour's servant.—

Mary. Poor man! He despises the gospel, he blasphemes our Saviour!

F. Never mind that. You know that notwithstanding your attachment to the gospel, he is perpetually asking you to marry him.

Mary. The Lord preserve me from it! F. But would you not save a soul, I say, once more?

Mary. Well, yes: What would you have me do?

F. Marry him.

Mary. [As if trying to discover her master's design.] Ah! "That if any obey not the word, they also may without the word, be won by the conversation of the wives." 1 Pet. iii. 1.

F. No, no, not at all; that passage suits the case of those already married; but I would never advise a Christian to marry an enemy to God with these hopes; probably she would be led astray herself.

Mary. But what am I to understand then?

F. What were you telling me of these children?

Mary. "*Qu'ins sont saints*" (that they are holy.)

F. Why?

Mary. Because they are born of Christian parents.

F. Where have you read that?

Mary. I do not exactly recollect; but I know that it is in the Bible.

F. Well: Augustus, look out the passage and read it.

Augustus found 1 Cor. vii. 14, and read, "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean, but now are they holy."

Mary wished that what preceded and followed these words should be read as far as verse 16;—asked leave to read them again herself, and became thoughtful. The unbelieving husband, said she to herself, but aloud, and weighing each word—the unbelieving husband sanctified (for the same word is used both respecting the father and children), the unbelieving sanctified only because he is married to a faithful wife . . . that is strange. . . . The unbelieving wife sanctified only because she is married to a faithful husband—and sanctified though she remains nevertheless unbelieving, (verse 13 and 16.) and the apostles expressing only a doubtful hope, (verse 16.) that one of the parties might eventually be saved. "What knowest thou O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? or how knowest thou O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?" . . . Thus they are sanctified in a sense, that does not at all imply that they have any part or lot in salvation. . . . I acknowledge to you, Sir, that I had never seen the subject in this point of view.

F. Well, what are we to say to Henry?

Mary. No, no, no; I never understood it before, I own. Children born of be-

lieving parents would not be on that account more sanctified, nor otherwise sanctified than a heathen would be, in outward union with the church of Christ.

F. "Think not to say within yourselves; we have Abraham to our Father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." Matt. iii. 9.

Mary. Every thing does not, however, appear to me decided on the subject of baptism; for it may be said, that probably God, under the new dispensation, besides a spiritual, has an outward people to whom baptism belongs, as circumcision to the people of Israel.

F. That is a point we shall have to examine; but, for the present, I would only ask, if you think the passage in question relates at all to the subject of baptism? Do you think in the time of the Apostles, when a wife became converted and was baptized, received at the Lord's table and considered a child of God, her husband remaining and enemy to the gospel, that he also should be baptized, received at the Lord's table, considered a child of God, or a saint in Christ Jesus?

Mary. Evidently not—How very clear! what proof! I am convinced I was in error.

John. It is very certain that if I could convert the wife of one of these vile Turks who are so wicked, the Turk would not, therefore, be a child of God, and ought not to be baptized, at least till he was converted too.

Aug. And yet the Bible says, that he would be sanctified by his wife.

F. "I thank thee O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." Matt. xi. 25, 26.

You see, then, added the father, that the unbelieving husband (who has not, according to other declarations in scripture, either part, or lot, or communion, or agreement, or affinity with those that believe,) is sanctified by the believing wife, and the unbelieving wife sanctified by the believing husband.

Mary. Evidently this word has not on all occasions the same meaning, but what does it here signify?

F. For the present, then, putting aside that in which we are agreed, and which is evident, before we speak of the signification of the words, let us rather say what they do not signify.

Mary. The certainly do not imply a sanctification such as would give a right, either to baptism, or to the Lord's Supper, or even to the name of a child of God.

F. I will then tell you my thoughts upon the subject, and the more readily, because, supposing it may not satisfy you, the difficulty will still remain as great on your part as on mine, at the same time proving, that the passage contains no authority, whatever, for the baptism of Infants.

Mary. It is agreed.

F. I beg you to observe, that in the chapter from which the passage is taken, which now occupies our attention, the subject is by no means the union of infants with the people of God. The new faith which the Corinthians had recently embraced, brought with it new duties, and destroyed old ones. There existed then, as there does indeed now, on the promulgation of the gospel, a conflict of duties; but these were to them the more difficult, as the whole was then entirely new to them. "There is to be no communion between believers and unbelievers," said they to Christians: he that leaves not for my sake, wife and children, and houses, and his own life also, is not worthy of me. These thoughts occupied the minds of the faithful, and caused them to apply to Paul (this is no supposition on my part, see 1 Cor. vii. 1.) on the subject of marriage. They ask him, if a believing husband ought to leave his unbelieving wife, and vice versa: that is clearly the subject: they feared lest an union with one who was unbelieving, was wrong. The great variety of duties that united man and wife, cemented as they should be by love, produced so terrible a conflict with the walk prescribed to Christians, that a woman who was obliged to obey her husband in a thousand sinful practices, might, at least, question these duties under this new order of things. And on the same ground, a believing husband had the same feeling with respect to his unbelieving wife.

Aug. Addressing John—That is just like you with your Turkish wife. I know, for my part, that if I were a woman, and this Turk should come to pay his addresses to me, and say, God is God, and Mahomet is his prophet. Oh! oh! oh!

F. Imagine to yourself a Corinthian returning from a midnight sacrifice to Bacchus or to Venus, intoxicated, filthy . . .

Here Mary shrunk with horror.—

F. Or wishing to take his wife to the Gladiators, in the temple of false gods, &c.

Paul, however, settles the point—Let not the wife depart from her husband—let not the husband put away his wife, (verse 10, and 11.) for the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband. (verse 14.) Therefore I would

ask, [I say not every one, for some are unjust judges.] but I would ask enlightened and unprejudiced judges: Does the subject here discussed, refer, in any measure, to the union of either of the married couple as such, with the kingdom of God? or rather is it not a question solely relative, whether considered in itself, or the context, to the union of the husband with the wife? Is not the question one between husbands and wives? In other words, is not this evidently the question?—Is the union sanctified or unsanctified?

I readily grant that it is not here a question in law, on the legitimacy of marriage, as is often said, for want of spirituality of mind, but rather a moral question on that subject.

Mary. I understand you again, Sir, and I am ashamed of the impatience and ignorance which I have hitherto shewn, in things I did not understand. I shall be very glad to hear you again on other parts of this question; but I acknowledge that you have already removed the strongest props to my former opinion.

F. Having come to this conclusion, the application is very easy. The Apostle, speaking on two subjects thus intimately connected, as is the reciprocal relationship of parents and children, he could not make use of the same word in the same sentence, in two different senses, and as the word is here applied to the moral purity of the union of the married couple, it must also apply to the moral purity of the birth of their children. "If your union was unsanctified, your children would be unsanctified, but now are they sanctified;" they are born of a union which the holiness of God does not improve.

I have already told you the rest; although some may dispute this explanation, and advance another, yet I think a more satisfactory one cannot be given, or one more just and natural; that which remains for us now is, to sum up the whole, [at least according to the above statement.] in these words. Children born of believing parents are not more, nor otherwise sanctified, and have no more right to baptism, than a heathen who is placed in connexion with a church of Christ, as outwardly favourable; that is to say, then, they have no right at all to it.

This does not imply, that Christian children do not have many advantages above those of the heathen. I am well convinced they have, and that they are immense; but I say that these advantages consist in the favorable circumstances in which they are placed, and that they are my no means inward and directly applied to the soul. They hear of the Saviour of mankind, they have the Bible, they receive, when their parents are faithful, continual directions in the way of truth and life. . . . And how shall the poor heathen believe who never hear the gospel? These are evidently the advantages connected with Christianity; they are so completely their own as to be an inheritance. But I am convinced that if providence had sent me, from its birth, a little Indian, to make him a member of my family, he would be as susceptible of the gospel as a baptized child. The milk of a Christian mother is no more christianized than that of a heathen.

Mary. Sir, no doubt remains with me on the point. These explanations even give me the key to some other difficulties that I have met with in the Acts of the Apostles on the same subject.

Aug. I will be bound it is the baptism of the households of which you are so often talking.

Mary. Just so.

John. Yes, but we hear of no children among them.

Mary. Very true, but I must say, nevertheless, it appears that these conversions by whole families, in which all believed, did not continue long; for we find in the Epistles that there were believing husbands with unbelieving wives, and vice versa. Thus, when one of the wedded pair was decidedly an unbeliever, it appears that he was regarded as such, even in the case when the head of a house became converted; and that when a whole house was baptized, it was because the whole house had believed in God. (Acts. xvi. 34.)

## FOR THE CHRISTIAN SECRETARY.

The existence of Infant Baptism, in the first and second centuries after Christ, examined and disproved in a series of numbers.

## NO. II.

Mr. Editor.

In your last paper I stated, and attempted to establish, the following proposition, viz:—During the 1st and 2d centuries of the Christian Era, the practice of instructing the children of Church Members into the knowledge of the Scriptures, and requiring of them a profession of their faith, before admitting them to baptism, was general, and, so far as we can learn, universal, in the Church at Rome, in the Church at Alexandria, and in the Church at Jerusalem. It is desirable, that the reader of this number, review the first number, before he read this. The writer must think, that the absence of the practice of Infant Baptism from the Greek Churches, established by the Apostles, during the first four centuries after Christ, is an argument sufficient to convince the candid mind, of the truth of the proposition, I have made; but there may be readers who have not been conversant with the history of the early Churches, and with the Geography of those Countries, where the Churches, which have been named, were situated,

and it often conduces to the influence of argument to render it cumulative. In the argument for the being of God, the proof derived from any one organ of sense in the human body is plenary; as from the eye, its structure, its situation and its use, yet it is not useless, but gives the argument weight and effect, to pursue investigation through the different organs of sense, and to consider these combined in one body; and to go from body to body, until all the human family are seen at one view, pointing upward to One Great First Cause—and to turn the eye to all the animal, and all the vegetable tribes, and to pry into the mineral kingdom; for their united testimony is—"there is a God."

The weight of argument grows upon us, as we extend our views still wider, and look at the numerous worlds, which hang on mighty power, and shine and roll, and harmoniously sweep their several rounds—"Giving to their Creator still new praise." The subject under discussion is one of no ordinary magnitude, and practical importance, since it has received the special notice of the descended God; and since it involves the honor of that Being, whose praise a united universe can but feebly speak; and, since the interests, the union, and harmony, and peace, and glory, of the Church of our Immanuel, are deeply concerned in it.

Reader, it is hoped, that you will read, as I ought to write, with humble and prayerful dependence on that spirit, who alone can lead us into all truth; with feelings of concern for the good of Zion, and with love to all, who bear the image of Christ, by whatever name they may be called. We are not contending with the enemies of God, but, with many sincere lovers of truth, who, we are constrained to believe are mistaken, and would not designedly do that, which is calculated to mar the beauty or the peace of Jerusalem. There is error somewhere. Let us know the truth, and practise it, that we may "fulfil all righteousness" in the fear of God.

"As plucking away one stone, on which a building stands, injures and endangers the whole house, or the leaving one leak though never so small, unstopped, hazards the loss of the largest ship; so disobedience to the least of God's commandments, known, alluded and persisted in, strikes at the authority by which all are enacted, and most effectually deprives us of all the advantages, that from the regularity of every other part of our conduct."

"If ye love me," said Jesus, "keep my commandments." It is his will, that we keep his ordinances, as he delivered them to us. In this manner did the Greek Churches keep the ordinance of baptism, until about the close of the 4th century, when some men began to express the opinion, that in cases where danger of death was apprehended, infants should be baptized, or immersed, this ordinance being originally performed in that way according to the testimony of the learned Pedo-baptist Masheim. "The sacrament of baptism," says this historian, "was administered in this (first) century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font." The same practice, i. e. immersion, continued for thirteen hundred years, almost unbroken throughout the world.

In the year 381 Gregory bishop of Constantinople delivered the following opinion in a public address, which opinion I have before me in the original Greek. "But, say some, what is your opinion of infants, who are not capable of judging either of the grace of baptism, or of the damage sustained by the want of it? Shall we baptise them too? By all means, if there be any apparent danger. For it were better, they were sanctified, without their knowing it, than, that they should die, without being sealed and initiated. As for others, I give my opinion, that, when they are three years of age, or thereabouts (for then they are able to hear and answer some of the mystical words, and, although they do not fully understand, they may receive impressions) they may be sanctified, both soul and body, by the great mystery of initiation."

This man, Gregory, bishop of Constantinople, was the son of Gregory, bishop of Nazianzum, but was not baptized in infancy, as it has been shewn. He had imbibed the opinion, that baptism was a saving ordinance, and he would do all he could to save souls. His motive seems to have been good, but the means he employed we are disposed to think inadequate to such a work, and in this, we presume, we have the concurrence of our Congregational brethren. It is evident, that Gregory did by no means advocate Infant baptism in its modern form. With the exception of such as were in apparent danger, he gave it as his opinion, that children should be baptized, when they were "three years old, &c." Here is the commencement of infant baptism in the Greek Church near the close of the fourth century, and founded on the supposed saving efficacy of the ordinance. I have begun my argument with the Greek Churches, because in them, it is clear, there was no such practice as infant baptism, till near the close of the fourth century, and because, it is equally certain, that among them the practice sprang from the mistaken notion, that the ordinance communicated to the subject saving grace. It is my design to look, next, at the Roman Church.

Here we find little to detain us. Since the advocates of infant baptism do not furnish any evidence of the existence of that practice all Rome, previous to the fourth century; and, since in the Church of St. Sophia at Constantinople, which in a manner grew out of the Roman Church, there is no vestige of the practice, until near the close of the fourth century; and, since the Apostles did not institute such practice in the Greek Churches, we are under the necessity of crossing the Mediterranean to seek in Africa what we cannot find in Rome. It is not to be supposed without evidence, that the practice had obtained in any other Churches in Italy, while it was not known in the Church at Rome, the principal or Metropolitan Church in that country, and a Church planted by Apostles. Our success in Africa may be better than in Greece and Rome. Our visit to Africa must be postponed a week, but our anticipations are in a measure forestalled by information of so general character as to apply to every branch of the Christian Church in the first ages. "In the earliest times of the Church," says Mosheim, "all, who professed firmly to believe, that Jesus was the only Redeemer of the world, and who, in consequence of this profession, promised to live in a manner conformable to the purity of his holy religion, were immediately received among the disciples of Christ. But, when Christianity had acquired more consistency, and Churches rose to the true God and his eternal Son, almost in every nation, this custom was changed for the wisest and most solid reasons. Then none were admitted to baptism, but such as had







From the Chataque Advertiser.

FREDONIA, Nov. 10.

**Miraculous Escape.**—On Monday last, near sunset, this village was alarmed by the cry that Mr. Charles Woodcock, an inhabitant of this village, was buried alive in the Rev. Eliza Tucker's well, about half a mile distant! Immediate assistance was rendered, and a few moments brought together something like a hundred people, with spades, shovels, &c.; and in about two hours he was taken from among the dirt and stones alive, where he was literally wedged in, his head and shoulders 7 or 8 feet below the surface, and not so badly injured but that he was able to be about the next day.

The well is about 25 feet deep, and was dug this fall. A short time after it was completed, the wall gave way and it filled up; and it had since been with considerable expense and trouble, taken up from the bottom and stoned the second time, by this Mr. Woodcock; and Mr. Tucker having expressed his fears that it was about to fall in again, Mr. W. descended into the well to examine it; and having proceeded down about 6 feet, remarking that all was sound, when Mr. T. cautioned him to be careful, stating that it was thereabouts that he feared it was giving away; and he had scarcely uttered the caution, when the stones began to roll, and in an instant he was buried in the ruins. But it was soon ascertained that he was alive, and could be distinctly understood from above calling, for help; and by his answering questions put to him, it was found that he was sane, and strong hopes were entertained of saving his life; notwithstanding a burthen of 5 or 6 feet of stones and earth lay upon him. He was completely shut in, both above and below, and on his shoulders, and head, lay large heavy stones which so confined his body, that he was unable to move a joint, or limb except one hand very trifling.

There was 6 or 8 feet of water in the well; and fortunately, a pole had previously been put down which rested on the bottom, and the stones in closing round it, left an aperture for the air to circulate, which enabled him to breathe freely.

The whole amount collected in Boston for the sufferers by fire in New Brunswick, including subscriptions and contributions in the churches, is between seven and eight thousand dollars.

**REVIEWS OF RELIGIOUS PUBLICATIONS.**  
Extracted from the London Evangelical and Baptist Magazines for October.

**A Father's Reasons for Christianity, in Conversations on Paganism, Mahomedanism, Judaism and Christianity.** By J. Timpson. 2s. Westley.

This is a luminous, well written, and highly instructive publication, admirably adapted for the improvement of youth.—Mr. Timpson has our cordial thanks.

**An Essay:—The Deity of Christ, the uniform Testimony of the Holy Scriptures.** By William Jones, Minister of Mawdesley-street Chapel, Bolton. 1s. 6d. Bayney.

There are in this seasonable and spirited Essay ten chapters, on the following momentous topics:—The importance of correct sentiments respecting the Person of Christ—The Names, Titles, and Perfections of Deity, ascribed to Christ by the sacred writers—The Works of Deity ascribed to Christ—Christ the proper object of Worship—The Scriptures positively assert the Godhead of the Redeemer—Evidence collected from the New Testament, where the Divinity of Christ, though not expressed, is implied—Evidence in favour of the Divinity of Christ, from the manner in which he wrought Miracles—The Offices, Characters, and Relations of Christ, under which he is represented in the word of God, all imply his essential Godhead—An Examination of those passages of the Holy Scriptures which are supposed to deny the Deity of Christ—The state of mind necessary to understand the Scriptures aright. This is really an excellent outline of one of the most important controversies that ever agitated the church of Christ.

From the Recorder & Telegraph.

Luke 16: 25. "Son, remember that thou in thy life-time receivest thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things."

If we believe the above on the authority of the Scriptures, and few are found willing openly to acknowledge their disbelief of Holy writ,—if we believe that some do actually receive all their good things in this world, and are to have no portion in that peace and joy which believers shall inherit in the next, how necessary does it seem, in order to the quiet of such persons in the possession of earthly good, that they should not be assailed with frequent compunctions of conscience for neglected duties; nor be often reminded of the pains of hell and the future punishment of the wicked. How necessary, that there should be some way contrived, by which they may seem to serve both God and Mammon:—for if they believed, as our Saviour asserts, that he who trusts in perishable riches is in danger of losing his soul, this would be a bar to their pleasures, and consequently deprive them of what it was the intention of Divine Providence to allot to those who choose the things of this world for their portion. How necessary does it appear, that some scheme should be invented, of which the

basis might be, that man is not originally and by nature corrupt,—that he is not conceived in sin,—that he is not totally depraved,—that Christ, who made so many alarming declarations on this subject, had little or no authority,—and that he was not God in any true sense, but a mere man with a little delegated power! I say, if the text be admitted, we see that such a system is necessary,—a system in which accountableness is chiefly done away, as a part of the general providence of God to man,—a system "which says to the Seers, see not; and to the prophets, prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits."

Montreal, (L. C.) Oct. 28th.

From the Richmond Enquirer.

MILTON'S NEW WORK.

A gentleman of Connecticut, with large fortune and considerable pretensions to literature, declared not long since, (as I was informed,) that "he intended to send to England for Shakspeare's last works." The idea was a new one, and to many incomprehensible; but how will these ignoramuses who affected to ridicule the proposition, hang their heads, when they learn that Milton's new works have just issued from the press; that the evidence for their authenticity is considered as conclusive; and that the Rev. Mr. Sumner, Librarian to his Majesty, Author, &c. &c. has thought them worthy of a translation and notes, from his own classical pen?

Having the utmost confidence in Mr. Sumner, we sincerely hope that he will give us some account of the finding of the treasure—where it has lain concealed—whether it is in the hand writing of a lady, &c. In the mean while we will venture to make one or two observations.

The manuscript is said to be in the hand-writing of one of 'Milton's daughters.' Dr. Johnson in his life of the poet, which, it has been well remarked, 'can never be surpassed,' mentions a story of Elizabeth Foster, a grand daughter of Milton's,—which seems to contradict this statement at once:—"She knew little of her grand father and that little was not good. She told of his harshness to his daughters, and his refusal to have them taught to write." Milton's well known cruelty to his children, corroborates this fact.

Again—The Editor of the New York American informs us that in the new treatise, Milton differs from the church of England, with regard to the "doctrine of the Trinity"—and the Editor of the Enquirer states (we presume on the authority of English papers) that the "author of Paradise Lost denies the divinity of our Saviour." If this be the case, one of two things is incontestably proved; either that the old man changed his notions in his dotage, or that the work in question is a forgery, for not to quote the many passages from the Paradise Lost, and Paradise Regained, which clearly and unequivocally declare the pre-existence and divinity of Jesus Christ—it will be necessary only to give one stanza from his poem composed in 1629, "On the morning of Christ's nativity."

"That glorious form, that light unsufferable, And that far-beaming blaze of Majesty, Wherewith he went at Heaven's high council table

To sit in the midst of Trinal Unity, He laid aside: and here with us to be, Forsook the courts of everlasting day, And chose with us a darksome house of mortal clay."

SMECTYMUS

TRAVELS IN THE EAST.

A paper published in Cambridge, Eng. under the date of Aug. 26, contains the following article:—

"The spirit of enterprise, which the late ever to be lamented Dr. Clarke so powerfully excited among the members of this University, has not suffered any abatement. A young man of fortune, lately of Trinity College, Mr. Bland, returned to Cairo with his friend, Mr. Crompton, on the 15th of last May, after a journey across the desert, which was attended with a good deal of hardship, from the want of water, and from the excessive heat. They had pursued the route of Moses and the Israelites, and, travelling with the Book of Exodus in their hands, had reached Mount Sinai. They drank their coffee on the spot where Moses received the Decalogue, visited the cave in which Elijah had taken refuge at Horeb; and placed themselves on the stone whereon Moses sat when his hands were lifted up, whilst Israel fought against Amalek. They discovered also several caves containing curious objects of antiquity not hitherto known or visited by any traveller. On their return to Cairo they were preparing to start for Jerusalem and Damascus. We hope to be gratified with further particulars of these interesting travellers."

**Danger of Reading in Bed.**—A gentleman of this town, who is in the habit of indulging in this hazardous practice, having been suddenly overcome by sleep, a few evenings ago, was aroused by an a-

larming sense of suffocating heat, and on opening his eyes perceived the curtains of the bed, and a part of the furniture in the room in a blaze. His terror and agitation may be easily conceived; but the servants being instantly summoned, the fire was happily extinguished before it had time to spread any farther. In a few moments more, the house would probably have been involved in the flames.—London paper.

The Georgia Baptist Association have dismissed their missionary to the Creeks, the Rev. L. Compere. Some objection was made by a part of the Association on the ground that he had not been indulged with the privilege of a hearing in his own defence.

Mr. Francis Green Macomber, of Waltham, has accepted the invitation of the Baptist Society in Beverly, Mass. to become their Pastor, and to be ordained on Wednesday, the 30th inst.

From the Connecticut Observer.

REASONS FOR NOT EMBRACING THE DOCTRINE OF UNIVERSAL SALVATION, IN A SERIES OF LETTERS TO A FRIEND.

LETTER VII.

DEAR SIR,—If you have attentively considered the testimony of the Bible which has been laid before you in proof of the endless punishment of the wicked, you are prepared, I think, for this general reflection.—There is no alternative, but either to admit that doctrine, or to reject the authority of the Bible. The scriptures do so plainly, and in such a variety of ways, assert the future punishment of the wicked, that if they do at the same time assert the contrary, they must be regarded as a medley of contradiction and absurdity. In this opinion I am confirmed by the fact, that the whole christian world, for eighteen hundred years, "some very few persons excepted," have actually been led by the Bible to believe that a part of mankind will be lost. Now if this sentiment be false and its opposite,—the salvation of all men—be true, the Bible, most unquestionably, ought to be rejected as an unsafe guide in matters of faith and practice. A book, which in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, should lead men astray in an article of vital importance to their present and future happiness, ought to be put out of their hands.

Indeed it may fairly be questioned whether Universalists in general have much respect for the authority of the Bible. Their views as to its divine inspiration are, I believe, usually very lax and have but little influence in the formation of their creed. They admit the testimony of the Bible, where it seems to be in their favour; but find little difficulty in rejecting it when it is against them. Hence it is a fact that deists are for the most part Universalists, and are generally the advocates and supporters of that denomination of Religion is, when they advocate or support any. And at the present day, infidels are extensively uniting their forces with Universalists; giving their money to build meeting houses and support ministers, and in some cases that I have known, they have done this, with the frank confession that they had no belief in divine revelation, but were induced to afford their aid because they regarded Universalism as on the whole nearer the truth than the faith of any other sect of christians, and as adapted to prepare the way for what they consider best of all, sheer deism. I do not deny that Universalists profess to receive the Bible as the word of God. But professed is nothing, where it is contradicted by practice. And any one who is acquainted with their mode of interpreting the Bible, or with their dishonest evasions of evidence, or who has noticed how fearlessly they wrest the scriptures and put them to the torture to make them deny their own testimony, and speak the language of their creed, must, I think, at least suspect, that their professed regard for the sacred volume is little else than a subterfuge to which they resort for the purpose of more successfully directing their poisoned arrows at the vitals of truth and godliness.

That I have not said this hastily, or without good reason, you will, I think, be satisfied, when I have laid before you some of the evasions by which the testimony of the scriptures to the doctrine of future punishment is rejected.

\* One method of evading that testimony is by adopting false principles of interpretation. By this expedient, all those passages of scripture in which the words everlasting, for ever and ever, are applied to future punishment, are set aside. The principle is this,—because the words have in some instances a limited meaning, therefore they may have in all instances. If this principle be correct, the word everlasting may have a limited meaning when applied to God; and even the self-existent Jehovah may cease to exist. So too the happiness of the righteous, though declared to be everlasting, may come to an end and the kingdom of Christ sink into non-existence. In the same manner, Universalists evade the force of those pas-

sages in which the word hell is used to denote the place of future punishment. Because the original words, translated hell, do not always mean the place of future punishment, they at once infer they never do. By the same mode of reasoning it might be proved that there is no place of happiness for the righteous in the future world. For the term heaven is often used to denote only the regions of our atmosphere. Thus the scriptures speak of the fowles of heaven—the rain of heaven; and of Mount Sinai burning in the midst of heaven. \*

But modern Universalism goes still further, and affirms that the words in the Hebrew and Greek scriptures translated hell do in no case denote either the place or the state of future punishment. Now this is palpably false as I shall soon show.—But suppose it were true,—suppose that Sheol of the Old and Hades of the New Testament mean only the invisible world, or place of departed spirits,—will it follow that all men shall be saved? By no means. The doctrine of future punishment rests on other sufficient testimony which is not in the least affected by the supposition now made. If there were not a word said in the Bible respecting the place and manner in which the wicked are to be punished, it would not make it at all the less evident that they are to be punished. God has said that they are to stand before the judgment seat, to give account of the deeds done in the body; that they shall receive the reward of their hands; that they shall go into everlasting fire—into everlasting punishment—and shall be punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. He who has denounced these threatenings against the wicked will be at no loss to find a place for the execution of them.—But the Universalist asserts what is not true when he says that the original words translated hell mean only the invisible world, and never denote a place of future punishment. For proof, let me request you to turn to the gospel of Luke, xvi. 23 And in hell,—in Hades—he lifted up his eyes being in torment. Does Hades in this passage mean only the world of departed spirits? Does it not denote a place of torment into which the rich man was conveyed after death and where he received the due reward of his deeds? And has not Sheol the same meaning in Ps. ix. 17, where it is said—the wicked shall be turned into hell (Sheol) and all the nations that forget God? If the word here mean only the grave or the place of departed spirits, what is threatened against the wicked who forget God, more than what is endured by the righteous who love and obey him? Both alike die and go into the world of spirits; and if this is all that is meant by the denunciation, I can see no propriety or justice in it. I might cite many other passages in which the terms in question plainly designate the place of future punishment. But my limits will not allow me to be more particular. Nor is it necessary. It is enough to show that the Universalist asserts what is false when he says that the terms translated hell, do in no case denote either the place or the manner of future punishment. That there is such a place is proved by the passages already cited: and if there is a place of torment prepared for the wicked, no doubt, those who possess this character will finally dwell there.

In regard to the meaning of the terms Sheol and Hades, I would suggest the following remarks as the result of a somewhat careful examination of the subject, Sheol of the Old Testament, and Hades of the New, are terms of the same import, and are commonly used as a general designation of the invisible world or place of departed spirits. This place was regarded by all the nations of antiquity, but especially by the Greeks and Romans, as divided into two parts; into one or the other of which all men entered at death, and were there rewarded or punished, according as they were righteous or wicked, good or bad in this life. They did not suppose that in this invisible state, departed souls were inactive, nor that they were all happy; but that they existed in a state of conscious activity in the separate mansions of Hades, and were happy or miserable, according to their respective characters.

Hades then, though a general designation of the world of spirits, actually carries in it the idea of future rewards and punishments. Sheol, I have said, is a term of the same import. It is always rendered in the Septuagint by the word Hades, and is admitted by the best critics to have the same meaning. What then is the conclusion? Why that Sheol and Hades denote that unseen world into which men enter at death; a world divided into two parts, one of which is the receptacle of the righteous who are in a state of happiness, and the other the abode of the wicked who are in a state of punishment. So the word Hades was always understood by the ancient Greeks; and so no doubt, the word Sheol was always understood by the ancient Jews and writers of the Old Testament. \*

How false then is the assertion of the Universalist, that the original words rendered hell, have no reference to a place of future punishment? Does he not know that he contradicts the opinion of all antiquity, and what is more, contradicts the plain language of the Bible? What can he say re-

specting the passage in the Psalm already alluded to; and especially respecting that in Luke in which our Saviour expressly mentions Hades as a place of torment.

\* But there is another term used to denote future punishment, much more definite than the two just considered. I refer to Gehenna. This word I know has been frittered away by Universalists to mean only a valley in the vicinity of Jerusalem. But how was it used by our Saviour? and how was it understood by the Jews who heard his discourses? I answer, with no fear of contradiction from any intelligent student of the Bible, that the Saviour always used this term to denote the place of future punishment; and that it was uniformly understood in this sense by the Jews of his time. It is a word peculiar to the Jews, and was employed by them some time before the coming of Christ to denote that part of Sheol which was the habitation of the wicked after death. This is proved by the fact of its familiar use in the New Testament; and by the fact of its being found in the Apocryphal books and Jewish Targums, some of which were written before the time of our Saviour. These Targums were translations and interpretations of the scriptures. Three of these Targums, in remarking upon the various passages of the Old Testament, use the word Gehenna, and expressly explain it to mean the place of future punishment for the wicked.\* If then our Saviour did not use this word in a totally different sense from that in which it was used by the persons whom he addressed, he must have employed it to denote the place of future punishment. And that he did thus use it, must be evident to any one who considers the passages in which the word occurs. Take a single example.

\* Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell, (Gehenna.) Does hell in this passage mean only the valley of Hinnom—a place near Jerusalem, rendered odious by its having been a scene of cruelty and pollution, and in which worms were found, and a fire was kept up to consume the carcasses and offals of various kinds that were thrown into it? The body, it is granted, might be destroyed in this place; but our Saviour speaks of the soul being destroyed in Gehenna. Does it not then designate a place far more terrible than the valley of Hinnom? The worms in this valley died, and the fire was often quenched; and while it burned it consumed nothing more than the body.

But the Gehenna with which sinners are threatened, is a flame that seizes the soul, and is never quenched. Of this place of endless wrath, the valley of Hinnom with its past idolatries and cruelties, with its blood and pollution; with its devouring worms and consuming fires, was no doubt the most striking image that could be suggested to the mind of a Jew.

And hence it was that in process of time, the name of the valley came to be used as the fittest and most terrific emblem of the world of punishment. But to infer from the fact that the term, when thus applied, has an allusion to the valley of Hinnom, that there is therefore no hell, is extremely weak. We might as well infer that there is no heaven, because the term Paradise, as used by our Saviour in his address to the dying thief, has an allusion to the garden of Eden,—or that we have no Wednesday nor Thursday, because these terms were employed by our Saxon ancestors, to designate the days devoted to the worship of their idols, Thor and Woden.

\* Another evasion to which Universalists resort is, that not sinners, but their sins, are to be destroyed in the future world. By this expedient, all those passages are set aside, which speak of the wicked as being consumed, cast away, and destroyed. According to some Universalists, such passages mean only that the vices and bad disposition of the wicked will be destroyed, while the wicked themselves will enter the kingdom of Heaven. And they gravely tell us, that by the goats placed on the left hand of the Judge, and by him doomed to everlasting punishment, we are to understand the crimes of sinners, and not sinners themselves. This wretched perversion of language is too palpably absurd to need refutation. When our courts of justice acquire the skill of punishing theft, and perjury, and murder, in the abstract, whilst the persons guilty of these crimes go free, it may perhaps be explained how the sins of the wicked at the last day, shall be sent away into everlasting punishment, while sinners themselves shall be received into Heaven.

Another evasion is, that all the punishment which sin deserves, or is threatened in the Bible, is endured in the present life. By this expedient all those passages which denounce destruction and woe to the wicked in a future state are set aside, as denoting only the evils which they endure in this world. But can any man in his senses admit such an opinion?

Does the curse of the law, the wrath of God, the worm that never dies, and the fire that is never quenched, the weeping, and the wailing, and the gnashing of teeth, described in the Bible, as the portion of the wicked, mean only the calamities which they endure in this life? Are the threatenings of Jehovah and the solemn—

\*See Empe's remarks on Universalism.

(continued from second to fourth page)